

1 DANIEL A. HOROWITZ (SBN 92400)
2 Attorney at Law
3 P.O. Box 1457
4 Lafayette, California 94549
5 Telephone: (925) 283-1863

6
7
8 Attorney for Plaintiff
9
10
11

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 MICHAEL SAVAGE,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC
16 RELATIONS, INC., COUNCIL ON
17 AMERICAN-ISLAMIC RELATIONS ACTION
18 NETWORK, INC., COUNCIL ON
19 AMERICAN-ISLAMIC RELATIONS OF
20 SANTA CLARA, INC. and DOES 3-100,

Defendants.

Case No. C 07-6076 SI

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF
IAN K. BOYD IN SUPPORT OF
OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR AN
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND
COSTS**

Date: November 14, 2008
Time: 9:00 a.m.
The Honorable Susan Illston

I, Ian K. Boyd, declare as follows:

1. I am a partner in the law firm of Harvey Siskind LLP. I have personal knowledge of
the matters stated herein, and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently thereto.

2. Local Rule 54(6)(b)(1) requires that any party bringing a motion for attorneys' fees provide a declaration that they have made a good-faith attempt to meet and confer to resolve the dispute before filing the motion. In his original declaration submitted in support of Defendants' Fees Motion filed on August 29, 2008, Matthew Zimmerman, counsel for Defendants, confirmed that he

1 spoke with me by telephone on August 26, 2008, regarding the Fees Motion. Mr. Zimmerman
 2 declares: "While the parties have not come to an agreement regarding how much (if any) of a fee
 3 award [Plaintiff] would be willing to stipulate to, but [sic] future conversations may take place."
 4 Zimmerman Decl., ¶16.

5 3. On October 23, 2008, counsel for Plaintiff submitted my signed declaration
 6 confirming that Defendants did not comply with their meet and confer obligations under Local Rule
 7 54-6(a). I have again reviewed my Declaration and everything stated therein is true and accurate.

8 4. On October 31, 2008, Defendants filed a reply brief in support of their Fees Motion
 9 ("Reply"), in addition to a Supplemental Declaration of Matthew Zimmerman.

10 5. In the Reply, Defendants assert that my Declaration contains "misrepresentations"
 11 regarding Defendants' failure to meet and confer which are "unfortunate." Reply, 6:13. For the first
 12 time,¹ Defendants now contend that they "did in fact meet and confer with Mr. Boyd regarding
 13 CAIR's fee motion, a conversation that confirmed that there was little reason to believe that further
 14 conversations would be anything but a waste of time." Reply, 6:15-17. This is quite a turn from the
 15 statements Mr. Zimmerman made in his Declaration, filed just after our conversation.

16 6. Mr. Zimmerman's Supplemental Declaration states that when he spoke with me on
 17 August 26, 2008, I allegedly "communicated" to him "in general terms what any settlement proposal
 18 would have to include for his client to seriously consider it. These terms were not acceptable to
 19 CAIR As a result of this conversation, I informed Mr. Boyd that there did not appear to be any
 20 likely basis for settlement."

21 7. No such statements were communicated by either party during our August 26
 22 conversation. I never advised Mr. Zimmerman of any preconditions that any settlement must contain,
 23 and he certainly never advised me that anything I said had caused him to believe that there was no
 24 basis for settlement.

25 8. During our conversation, I did ask Mr. Zimmerman whether his client would be
 26 seeking fees for both the Copyright and RICO elements of the case under Section 505 of the

27 28 ¹ Had Defendants disclosed these contentions in their opening papers, my Declaration in support of Plaintiff's Opposition
 would have addressed the points herein.

1 Copyright Act, and Mr. Zimmerman said yes. We briefly discussed the legal merits of whether it was
 2 appropriate under the Copyright Act to seek attorneys' fees expended to defend the RICO claim, and
 3 Mr. Zimmerman conveyed that it was his clients' position that they were entitled to a reimbursement
 4 of all of their fees. I told Mr. Zimmerman (I thought quite reasonably) that I could not provide any
 5 substantive response until I knew the amount of fees his client was seeking. Mr. Zimmerman did not
 6 appear to disagree with this point. He told me that he did not yet know the amount of fees being
 7 sought, and he could not even give me an approximation (notwithstanding that it had been almost two
 8 weeks since the Court's entry of judgment, and Defendants had ample time to compute most of their
 9 accumulated fees in the interim). He said he would try to get back to me with this figure the
 10 following day, which would still be two days before the filing deadline for the Fees Motion, and we
 11 concluded our conversation. Yet as noted in my original Declaration, Mr. Zimmerman did not
 12 provide any substantive follow up before Defendants filed the Fees Motion.

13 9. At no point in time prior to filing the Fees Motion did Mr. Zimmerman ever inform
 14 me that "there did not appear to be any likely basis for settlement." Moreover, such a statement is
 15 inconsistent with not only my Declaration, but Mr. Zimmerman's Declaration and his e-mail to me of
 16 August 26 (attached as Exhibit A to my original Declaration). If some supposed preconditions
 17 communicated by me were a bar to settlement, why did Defendants still agree to provide the amount
 18 of fees that their motion would be seeking at a time just before the filing of the Fees Motion, which
 19 would disclose this figure anyway? If I had communicated some alleged requirement which caused
 20 Mr. Zimmerman to tell me that settlement would not happen, why did he send me an e-mail after our
 21 call stating "I'm still consulting with my clients about the matters we discussed and will aim to get
 22 back to you by tomorrow"? If settlement was off, why did Mr. Zimmerman's original Declaration
 23 state that "future conversations may take place?"

24 10. Defendants have directly accused me and my firm, Harvey Siskind LLP, of making
 25 "misrepresentations" to the Court. Such an accusation is not only incorrect, but offensive. I will of
 26 course defer to the Court regarding how much weight, if any, it wishes to place on Defendants'
 27 failure to make a good-faith attempt to follow Local Rule 54-6 prior to filing their Fees Motion, and

1 what consequence, if any, Defendants should suffer for this failure. I will further defer to Mr.
2 Horowitz, counsel for Plaintiff, to argue the substantive merits opposing the Fees Motion on
3 Plaintiff's behalf. What I cannot defer on is setting the record straight.

4 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
5 is true and correct and that this declaration was executed this 9th day of November, 2008, in San
6 Francisco, California.

7
8 
9 Ian K. Boyd
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28